

REMARKS

Applicants have cancelled Claim 17 and added new Claims 31-34 in this paper.

Applicants thank the Examiner for a thorough consideration of the application, but traverse the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Centers et al. (U.S. 6,471,486) in view of Culp, III et al. (U.S. 5,975,854).

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ARGUMENT

Foremost, Applicants take issue with the Examiner's position,

"that the exact location of these control blocks does not sufficiently depart from the inventive concept of Centers device. There is no significant difference between placing all the control blocks into one control room, and placing the control blocks on the compressors. Mounting a control block to the compressor it is assigned to would be obvious in order to integrate the design of the compressor, reduce control block to compressor wiring, i.e. network set up, and simplify control block to compressor identification."

Office Action mailed December 3, 2003, Page 3-4. It is for exactly the reasons the Examiner stated that Applicants' invention is significant, namely, integrating compressor design, reducing control block to compressor wiring and network setup, and simplifying control block to compressor identification. Why are these not worthy design objectives and inventive subject matter?

The reason the Examiner does not find these items in the prior art is because Applicants' invention is novel and nonobvious. As explained in the pending patent application, Applicants' invention,

"incorporates internally integrated sensing, protection and control functions not provided by the prior art motor protection modules in use today. The control and protection system of the present invention integrates these functions with the compressor for improved overall system cost, reliability and value and thus

provides improved compressor protection, simpler system wiring, diagnostics and communications. The advanced compressor control and protection system of the present invention provides a common hardware platform for a broad range of compressor modules. The system of the present invention provides a reduction in cost due to common electronics platform for all sensing and control functions, higher reliability due to improved protection because of common logic incorporating a multiplicity of sensor and status information as well as reduction in cost and improved reliability due to reduction in field wiring of individual stand-alone protection systems."

Because the prior art – as the Examiner has noted – fails to disclose the claimed improvements, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims.

PRIOR ART ANALYSIS

The intelligence, memory, communication functions and integrated sensing features of Applicants' claimed invention present patentable advances over the disclosure of Centers et al., which requires a stand-alone control system. Further, the combination of prior art cited by the Examiner fails to disclose a compressor assembly including a shell, a compression mechanism disposed in said shell, a motor driving the compression mechanism and disposed in the shell, and a control block mounted on the shell, including a pluggable gateway board and operable to store compressor configuration information, as well as a system master in communication with the control block and operative to receive and store compressor configuration information from the control block. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.



Neither Culp et al. nor Suzuki teach a control block mounted on a compressor shell and including a pluggable gateway whereby the control block is operable to store compressor configuration information. It is particularly noteworthy that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest application to a compressor and is not viewed by Applicants to be particularly relevant.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 19, 2004

By: [Signature]
Michael Malinzak
Reg. No. 43,770

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MM:ca

RECEIVED

FEB 27 2004

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700